

Serial Number 10/522,472  
Docket Number CH920020013US1  
Amendment Page 7 of 9

### REMARKS

Claims 1-22 were pending in the application and all were rejected. Claims 1, 4, 7, 12, and 16- 20 and 22 have been amended. Claims 8, 20 and 21 have been canceled. Support for the claim amendments can be found in paragraph [0064] of Applicant's disclosure as published in United States Publication No. 2006/0233364. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration.

### CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 USC §102

The Office Action rejected claims 4-6, 13, 16, and 17 under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Hopkins et al. (US Patent Publication No. 20030120931). For a reference to anticipate a claim, each element and limitation of the claim must be found in the reference.

*Hoover Group, Inc. v. Custom Metalcraft, Inc.*, 66 F.3d 299, 302 (Fed. Cir. 1995).

Claim 4 has been amended to clarify the invention and to add a step of aborting sending of the message if the public cryptographic key has been revoked. Hopkins does not teach or suggest the step added by amendment.

Claims 5, 6, 13, and 16 are dependent on claim 4 and are hence not anticipated for the same reasons as claim 4.

### CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 USC §103

The Office Action rejected claims 1-3, 9-12, and 22 under 35 USC 103(a), as being unpatentable over Schweitzer et al. (US Patent No. 5,850, 450) in view of Hopkins.

Claim 1 has been amended to clarify the invention and to add a step of aborting sending of the message if the public cryptographic key has been revoked. The combination of

Serial Number 10/522,472  
Docket Number CH920020013US1  
Amendment Page 8 of 9

Schweitzer and Hopkins does not teach or suggest the step added by amendment.

Claims 2, 3, and 9-11 are dependent on claim 1 and are patentable for the same reasons discussed above.

The Office Action rejected claims 7, 14, 18, and 19 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hopkins.

Claim 7 has been amended to clarify the invention and to add a step of aborting sending of the message if the public cryptographic key has been revoked. The combination of Schweitzer and Hopkins does not teach or suggest the step added by amendment.

Claims 14, 18, and 19 by virtue of their dependence on claim 7 include the limitation of aborting the message discussed above and hence are not rendered obvious by the cited references.

The Office Action rejected claims 8, 15, 20, and 21 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hopkins in view of Johnson (US Patent Publication No. 20010014153), further in view of Staddon et al. (US Patent Publication No. 20040017916).

Claims 8, 15 and 21 been canceled thus mooted their rejection. Moreover, the Johnson and Staddon references do not teach or suggest the limitation added by the amendment. While, Shaddon discusses a revocation, it is a revocation of a user not a revocation of a public cryptographic key as claimed.

For the foregoing reasons, Applicant respectfully requests allowance of the pending claims.

The Director is hereby authorized to charge any fees which may be required, including